



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,593	09/10/2003	Back-Woon Lee	YOM-0057	5378

7590  
Cantor Colburn LLP  
55 Griffin South Road  
Bloomfield, CT 06002

02/20/2007

EXAMINER
----------

SHERMAN, STEPHEN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/20/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/659,593	LEE, BAEK-WOON
Examiner	Art Unit	
Stephen G. Sherman	2629	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 09 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 112, second paragraph.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

AMR A. AWAD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Although the applicant's response has overcome the 112, second rejections, the applicant's arguments with respect to the art rejections are not persuasive. The applicant argues the limitation: "wherein a portion of at least one of the gate lines and the data lines located adjacent to the white pixel has a line width larger than a width of other portions of the respective gate lines and the data line" on page 10 of the response. The applicant states that Figure 6 of Yoshida is improperly characterized by the examiner, and that Yoshida does not teach that white pixels are smaller than the three primary colors. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner understands that TFTs are well known in the art, as stated by the applicant, and therefore the applicant should know that the portions of lines corresponding to these TFTs will be of larger width than the rest of the lines. Furthermore, the examiner knows that Yoshida does not teach of the white pixels being smaller than one of the primary colors and that is why Tsutomu is used to teach the feature. The applicant needs to remember that the rejection is based on a combination of reference and that the applicant cannot show nonobviousness by attacking the references individually. Further, the examiner understands the applicant's invention and that the combination of Tsutomu and Yoshida does not teach the INVENTION, however, the combination DOES TEACH THE CLAIMED INVENTION, as described in the rejection and in the examiner's explanation above. The claim does not say that the larger portions of the data and gate lines cannot be those corresponding to a TFT and therefore the teaching of Yoshida can be applied to teach the claims.